



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lighter play upon the more serious task immediately at hand. Our essentials must be taught and must be learned even at the peril of pain and rebellion, and the technique aiming at a mastery of that body must include writing. Writing not only emphasizes the disciplinary aspect, but also fortifies the cultural, because that cultural enrichment without a real basis of knowledge is mere idle, intellectual dissipation. The very artificialities of the Latin literary language which became a fixed medium, the very fact that it acquired a definite form and outline, the very fact that finality attended so many of its modes of expression render the writing of it all the more important a corrective of intellectual indolence. That necessary precision involved in correct Latin composition checks the young, untrained mind, accustomed to loose thinking and to looser phrasing. If it be urged that this seems all too much like hampering freedom and individuality, it should be borne in mind that the brain of the average¹ student has attained its full size and weight, and that the sensory and motor areas are fully matured. Therefore, at this stage, improvement is especially needed in precision and decision. Unless freedom be misregarded as license, unless individuality be misinterpreted as the sophistry of impulse untrained, the discipline of mental aptitudes, resulting from the writing of Latin prose, is most likely to promote these *desiderata* of decision and precision.

While serving as a *means* to the mastery of vocabulary, forms, syntax and sentence-structure, the writing of Latin will inevitably prove the best means of acquiring the ability to move with firmness and security among the difficulties of the language that will later present themselves in the reading. Writing does *not* necessarily lead to fluency in reading any more than *reading* or oral work immediately creates the ability to write easily and correctly. Yet it is true that the ability to write correctly is the greatest test of the student's accurate knowledge and will be the surest foundation for subsequent correct though slow reading. For *rapid* reading ability, or ability to read at sight, somewhat different methods must be employed; such methods, however valuable if applied properly at a later time, are in a measure alien to the more rigorous plan outlined above, and if applied too early are even prejudicial to the best results. An adherence to our stricter methodology may be old-fashioned and not in line with a recent tendency that, influenced by modern language studies, emphasizes the need of learning to read readily as early as possible. But many a later catastrophe in school-life has unquestionably resulted from a failure of the student to build the foundation of his house as firmly as our scheme of work contemplates. Even in *this* scheme the writing of Latin

remains merely a means¹ to an end; it is not ability to write with stylistic elegance that is sought at this time or even later. As an instrumental knowledge, Latin composition accentuates the benefits and epitomizes the problems of first year Latin. More than this, it helps to develop that honesty of habit and sincerity of thoroughness which are not only the basis for all future work in Latin, but which are admittedly one of the great contributions of Latin study to education and so to life. On the other hand, tendencies involving less rigorous methods imply that we have lost somewhat of the earlier Spartan character of our discipline.

The aim of all this writing will be to create lasting impressions, and, if possible, to assist to a language consciousness. Writing and writing only will lead the first year student to an intimate knowledge of the anatomy of the language; writing and writing only will acquaint him with the physiology of the language as that is revealed in organic sentence-structure; and writing and writing only will suggest the soul of that language. But as much writing puts upon the student the burden of immense expenditure of time and effort, so upon the teacher there rests a moral obligation of sacrifice in the interest of the student's accuracy. An unreserved devotion to all the obligations of this task requires a love and a faith rarely found in any but the stout hearts of martyrs. All too easily subterfuges are found and excuses are conjured up. The success of the late, lamented Henry Gray Sherrard may, perhaps, encourage fainter hearts. Possessed of luminous imagination, fertile invention, and an enthusiasm which kindles even unto these later years, teaching was ever a consecration with him, and the *writing of the correct form* was one of the great requisite virtues that might open to the faithful disciple the kingdom of classical *mirabilia*.

GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

LATIN IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Again and again we teachers of the Classics in the secondary schools are told that we must mend our ways, if we do not wish to be dispossessed from the Latin mansion as we have already been from the Greek. Statistics are quoted from this source and that to prove that Latin has entered on the downward path, the results of the Entrance Examinations are held up to us as the Mene Tekel of our impending doom—and then we are left to our own devices. If it is true that the Lord helps him who helps himself, then it would seem to be time for the down-trodden mere teacher to rise and defend himself.

I do wish to state once as tersely as I can the

¹ Cf. P. Dettweiler, in A. Baumeister's *Handbuch der Erziehung u. Unterrichtslehre für höhere Schulen*, Vol. III (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.85-86); J. E. Barrs, *The What and the How of Classical Instruction*, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.34-36.

¹ See J. M. Tyler, *Growth and Education*, 180.

difficulties which beset our path, especially in the large cities. In the school with which I am connected, there are received every half year some 425 boys, chiefly recruited from the grammar schools. These pupils are received on certificate of maturity and scholarship from their principals. About one-fifth of these elect German as their first language, the rest, either of their own choice, or because lack of space does not permit us to teach French during the first year, take up the study of Latin. During the first year these pupils are expected to cover the following ground: all forms, with the exception of the imperative of the verb; the chief uses of cases, the purpose, result and indirect discourse constructions, relative and causal clauses, gerund and gerundive, in their elementary aspects only. In addition, they read the first 22 chapters of the War with the Helvetians, and do a fair amount of translation from English into Latin, at the rate of about four sentences per diem. This amount of work is in reality a reduction in the requirements, made during the last three years. Formerly 29 chapters of the Helvetian War, and five lessons of an elementary prose book were covered. Not counting losses by withdrawal from the school, there are left at the end of the year, and judged capable to continue the course, about 60% of the pupils. Teachers of the third term—Caesar—are, however, constantly complaining of the inferior character of the students coming into their classes. An investigation into the causes seems to show that the responsibility lies largely with circumstances outside the school itself. For two and a half years, we have been compelled to employ a varying number of substitute teachers, young college graduates without experience, and frequently with but a very meager knowledge of Latin. Through a readjustment of programs and appointments these conditions have been recently altered—I dare not say, improved. For I do not consider it an improvement that our teachers now teach five classes of five periods each, instead of four. Twenty-five periods of work appear to me by far too large an allotment to a man, especially in the first year, with classes varying from 35 to 48 pupils. In no grade is the written work of more importance than in the first two; yet no man can be expected to correct from 175 to 225 exercises every day and keep mentally sound. Only a change in the financial conditions of the municipality can bring the needed betterment.

Even apart from this condition, however, I believe that no material elevation of results is possible. It is all very well to say that hard work is a fine discipline, that boys must not be coddled, but after all it remains true that nothing will be well done but what is gladly done, and our boys do not love their Latin. Nor do I see how they can. To feed a boy day after day on such pabulum as The Helvetians wage war with the Germans, The soldiers were praised by the

general, and so forth, must be nauseating in the end. The defect is by no means restricted to the special book, excellent in its way, which we are using. Any book which prepares for Caesar, and not for Latin suffers from the same disease. Nor do I see that other beginners' books are any better, least of all the books which tell stories like this: The red rose is beautiful, The girl gives a beautiful rose to the noble queen. The great and fundamental defect of all our first year books, as far as I can see, is, that they either are imbued with the *vocational* idea, that is, they wish to accomplish only a highly specialized end, or they are remodeled from German books, which were written for children of nine years of age, and are correspondingly childish. The *sine qua non* for a successful first Latin book, I believe, is a previous investigation into the psychology of the fourteen year old boy. This much I am willing to adopt from Professor Dewey's statement that a child should be taught nothing but what it demands.

In the second place, I believe that we should take a leaf out of the wreath of modern language teaching, and model our books so that they teach the beginner something about the life and the way of thinking of the Roman nation. Gurlitt's *Fibel*, rewritten for boys of a more advanced age, would seem to me to come nearer to this demand than any other book. I am fully alive to the objection that such a book will largely consist of *made* Latin. But I confess that I do not share this objection. Provided that the maker of the book is a sound scholar, and that he will not admit into his book anything which is not classical language—I do not mean constructions found in Caesar and Cicero but a few times—a boy can learn just as much Latin from *made* exercises as from others.

A third requisite for a good first book would be *limitation*. All of our first books undertake to teach by far too much. The first year should be strictly limited to what is essential: the five declensions—and I sincerely hope that the mixed stems will give way to a more sensible way of teaching—the four regular conjugations, *sum*, and *possum*, but not *fero* and *eo*, the regular adjectives, including comparison and adverbs, but only a very few irregular comparisons, the personal, possessive, demonstrative, relative and interrogative pronouns and no others, the most important prepositions. That would seem to be all that is necessary to start the pupil in reading.

On the other hand, I do not share the modern abhorrence of composition work. During the first year, on the contrary, translation from English into Latin should equal, if not surpass, the translation from Latin. For if application, and immediate application at that, is a sound pedagogic principle, such application in language work is best given by the making of Latin words and sentences on the part of the student.

There remains the old crux of our work, the acquisition of a vocabulary. As far as quantity goes, the question would seem to have been settled by almost unanimous consent: about 500 to 600 words are not too large a demand. The question is: how is this amount to be acquired? Here nothing, in my opinion, can take the place of the old-fashioned way of memorizing. Every day should see the calling for a small number of new words and the review of a larger number of old words, either orally or better still, on the blackboard or on paper. In this connection let me say that three or five minutes given each day to a little review test would not only be no waste of time, but would actually prove a time saver. I am not old fashioned enough, however, to condemn the student merely to a mechanical acquisition of the vocabulary. On the contrary, I wish from the very beginning to employ all possible helps: elementary etymology, comparison with English derivatives, the laws of composition. All of these should daily enter into the teaching.

In the last place, we are still sinning against the precepts of sound educational theory by making our assignments indefinite, and by throwing too much of the burden of acquisition upon the pupil. Personally, I should go over each new lesson in class, not only, as is usually done, for explanation, but in actual practice. No sentence should be prepared by the student at home which he has not gone over with the teacher in the classroom. His home work should be merely a review of what he has been taught during the day in school, and he should have been told exactly what is of importance in the work and what is only incidental.

Such teaching, of course, makes a demand on the teacher's time which at present he sees himself unable to devote to his work. But with the limitations indicated above it seems to me that the time can be found, and I am convinced, from my observations in the classroom, that thus to make haste slowly is an exceedingly good investment of time and labor.

Yet, with all these ideal requirements, I am afraid, the results, in our school at least, will continue to fall far short of reasonable expectations. The reason for this gloomy view is that we are hampered by two obstacles. In the first place, a large number of our students are not sufficiently masters of the English language readily to express themselves in it. I will quote a concrete example. There is at present in one of my classes a boy, very industrious and very attentive, who when called upon to give a review translation of the text, always does good work. But the same boy, when called upon to do advanced work, is well able to give the translation of every clause, and to explain the constructions, but he can not put his translation into intelligible English, because, as inquiry has shown, he speaks no English except at school. This is an extreme case, but to a

lesser degree the same difficulty is met with in a number of boys. In the second place, boys are hampered by an ignorance of grammatical terms. Our English teachers often deny point blank the necessity of teaching grammar, and the burden of doing so is thrown on the teachers of the foreign language. These are further hampered by the difference in terminology. I hold no brief for the grammatical terms of Latin. On the contrary, it is immaterial to me whether I teach Attribute Complement or Predicate Noun-Adjective. But I do wish to express myself in a language intelligible to my students. The recent movement (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, 3, 8, 64) to work toward an uniformity in grammatical terminology has my warm support all the more as some years ago I tried to bring about such uniformity in the school with which I was then connected—an effort which met with the decided opposition of many of my colleagues.

ERNST RIESS.

REVIEWS

Supplementary Papers of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome: Volume 2. Published for the School by The Macmillan Co.: New York (1908). Pp. ix. + 293.

This volume of papers by students of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome was made necessary by the fact that there was no room for these articles in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, which is the normal medium of publication of work done by members of the School. The cost of the volume was met by a grant of three thousand dollars from the Carnegie Institution. As a result we have before us a sumptuous volume, in the form known now as large octavo, richly illustrated. But there is one drawback to this sumptuousness: the book will be beyond the means of the ordinary student.

The present volume contains four papers: The Advancement of Officers in the Roman Army, by George H. Allen, 1-25; Roman Monumental Arches, by C. Densmore Curtis, 26-83; The Palimpsest of Cicero De Re Publica, by A. W. Van Buren, 84-262; Inscriptions from Rome and Central Italy, by James C. Egbert, 263-290. There is a brief index, 291-293. There are 41 illustrations in the text. Of these 18 show arches at various places; the remainder picture some of the inscriptions discussed by Professor Egbert. There is also, in connection with Mr. Allen's paper, a Plan Indicating the Relative Rank of Officers in the Roman Army.

Mr. Allen's paper analyzes and tabulates the system of promotion that obtained in the Roman Army in the first three Christian centuries; all branches of the army have been subjected to thorough study, a study which rests throughout entirely on epigraphical sources. We now have clear evidence of a